

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|--|-------------------|------------------|
| AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT | | | 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | | PAGE 1 OF 4 PAGES | |
| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. Three (3) | | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE 11/07/01 | | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO Request No. 2093 | | 938-0500 |
| 6. ISSUED BY CODE U.S. Agency for International Development Bureau for Humanitarian Response Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation Washington, D.C. 20523-7600 | | 7. ADMINISTERED BY CODE (If other than Item 6) | | | | |
| 8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP code) | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. M/OP-02-008 | | |
| | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) September 12, 2001 | | |
| | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. | | |
| | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) | | |
| CODE | | FACILITY CODE | | | | |
| 11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS | | | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified. | | | | | | |
| 12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required) | | | | | | |
| 13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14. | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A. | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: | | | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority) | | | | | | |
| E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office. | | | | | | |
| 14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible) | | | | | | |
| 1. The purpose of this amendment is to provide answers/clarifications to questions received in response to Solicitation No. M/OP/-02-008, dated September 12, 2001 (see attached pages 2-4). 2. The Closing Date of December 11, 2001, and Closing Time @ 5:30 p.m. (EST) remain unchanged. | | | | | | |
| Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect. | | | | | | |
| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print) | | | | 16A NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) | | |
| | | | | Ellen R. Wills, M/OP/HRAM/AFP | | |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR | | 15C. DATE SIGNED | | 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | | 16C. DATE SIGNED |
| (Signature of person authorized to sign) | | | | (Signature of person authorized to sign) | | |

RFA FY 2002 CHILD SURVIVAL GRANT PROGRAM**Questions and Answers**

Q: If the child survival program were done in the same zones as the Title II areas, would it be possible to do a cost share of staff? (I.e., perhaps 50/50 for the nutritionists and staff involved in Hearth Nutrition Model and IMCI).

A: This is permissible as long as the staff plan makes sense in the context of the proposed program and the pro-rated staffing provides sufficient coverage for project activities.

Q: Can the Child Survival areas and Title II health program areas coincide in terms of geography or must they be completely separate?

A: The program areas may be the same and close collaboration is encouraged.

Q: Would it be permissible and desirable to use the KPC survey in March 2002 for a child survival project that would commence in October 2002?

A: Although the KPC survey may be conducted at any time prior to the start of the program, approved Child Survival programs may not expend grant funds before the start of the program or receive reimbursement for activities conducted prior to negotiating and signing a new cooperative agreement.

Q: Is it allowable to include population segments such as children up to 12 years of age, teenagers from 13 to 18 years of age, and/or pregnant women among the potential beneficiaries of the program?

A: The primary purpose of the program is to target children under five years and women of reproductive age. Children up to 12 years of age and teenagers from 13 to 18 years may be indirect beneficiaries as long as the program intervention serves the primary target population.

Q In Section 5 – Organizational Development, what exactly is meant by “system” (i.e., systems levels, each system identified) in paragraph 1? What is meant by “the cost for doing so”? Is this in general terms, relative terms, or are specific financial figures required?

A: By systems, the application is requesting a description of the various organizational levels in place that will be targeted for capacity building. These system levels may include the applicant’s headquarters, health program unit, field office, project site and any others that may be applicable for capacity building. The proposal should explain what the various levels are and what makes the best sense in terms of building their capacity through needs assessments and targeted interventions. The proposal should also identify the cost for implementing organizational development and capacity building and provide this information in the budget.

Q: There is considerable overlap between the sustainability objectives and the results based objectives, specifically at levels 2, 3, and 4. Shall we list all levels of objectives in the program approach and in the sustainability section discuss in more detail what activities/support will be provided to accomplish the objectives related to sustainability. The only problem is that those objectives will be repeated/listed in two places. How do you suggest we deal with this?

A: The objectives only need to be listed in one place in the document (e.g., the Performance M&E matrix), and then cross-referenced in other sections as appropriate.

Q: Does an Entry Grant applicant need to have experience implementing health-related programs in more than one developing country?

A: For the FY 2002 RFA, more than one developing country experience is a requirement for all applicants. BHR/PVC is reviewing this requirement for future Child Survival Grant Program RFAs.

Q: The second paragraph under New Category in the Award Categories section reads, “Applications for a New Program may be submitted for a previously funded site only if the proposed program is substantially different in approach and interventions.” Please clarify in quantifiable terms what “substantially different” means.

A: “Substantially different in approach and interventions” means that the new application provides a compelling justification for proposing a new program with new strategy, design and intervention in the same site with the same beneficiary population.

The geographic area of the new program may or may not be the same as the original program.

An alternative category is the Cost Extension category for the expansion of an original program and/or beneficiary population (e.g., expanding geographic area), emphasizing growth and innovation, as well as adding new strategies and/or interventions. The original program should have demonstrated significant results and potential for scale up.

Q: Are the names, affiliations, and/or positions of the Proposal Reviewers available?

A: Please refer to Section IV, “Review Process and Evaluation Criteria,” of the RFA. A debriefing package is sent to the applicant sometime in the spring, after funding decisions have been made. The debriefing package includes the number and Bureau name of technical reviewers who scored on the application. The names of the individual reviewers/scorers are not released.

Q: If a PVO has an existing Child Survival Program in a given country, can it also be a sub-grantee in the same country?

A: It is possible for a PVO to be a sub-grantee in a country where it already has an existing program.

The sub-grant will not count towards the limit of two new programs per PVO per year, or the total of eight programs per PVO per year.

Q: The RFA states that the PVO must "be operational and have a presence in the country where the child survival program is proposed". Does this mean that the US PVO must have staff in-country or can it be interpreted more broadly to mean that the PVO is implementing a program in the proposed country?

A: A PVO must be operational and have a presence in the country where the child survival program is proposed, documented by a signed agreement with the host government included in the application. The reason that this requirement was instituted was to avoid having PVOs apply, and be funded for programs in countries in which they had no legal authorization to operate. In addition, in order for a PVO to begin program implementation as soon as the grant is signed, "being operational and having a presence" facilitates program start up.